arXiv:hep-ph/9710314v1 10 Oct 1997

BA-97-25
CERN-TH/97-275

μ Problem and Hybrid Inflation in Supersymmetric $\mathbf{SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}}$*

G. Dvali[(1)], G. Lazarides[(1,2)] and Q. Shafi[(3)]

[(1)] *Theory Division, CERN, CH-1211, Geneva 23, Switzerland*

[(2)] *Physics Division, School of Technology, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki GR 540 06, Greece.*

[(3)] *Bartol Research Institute, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716, USA*

Abstract

We present a solution of the μ problem within a supersymmetric model based on the $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ gauge group. We show that this solution implies a built-in hybrid inflationary scenario, which may result in a successful baryogenesis via leptogenesis. Baryon number is essentially conserved as a result of an R-symmetry. Neutrinos with mass in the eV range can provide the 'hot' dark matter component.

*To be submitted to Phys. Lett. **B**

It is well known that the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) leaves unanswered a number of fundamental questions. For instance: *i*) How does the well known parameter μ originate? *ii*) How is the inflationary scenario realized? *iii*) How is 'hot' dark matter (in neutrinos with mass in the eV range) incorporated in order to explain the observed large scale structure formation, especially if the primordial density fluctuations are (essentially) scale invariant? *iv*) Why is the proton so stable, even though 'matter' parity allows the dimension five process?

In this paper, we will investigate an extension of MSSM which provides a resolution of these issues. In our analysis, the new physics enters at a scale M well above the weak scale M_Z so that, when the superheavy states are integrated out, we obtain MSSM with the μ parameter determined. It turns out, as we will see, that a natural candidate for such a structure is based on the gauge group $G_{LR} = SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_R \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_{B-L}$. Left-right (L-R) symmetric models based on this gauge group have been extensively studied in the past [1], as well as more recently [2] in the supersymmetric context. Since our focus lies on the points listed above we shall, for simplicity, relax the requirement of L-R symmetry in the higgs sector and concentrate on the minimal possible version of a theory based on the gauge group G_{LR}. We later indicate how this scheme could be embedded in a fully L-R symmetric model which, in principle, may be the complete $SO(10)$ model.

Before proceeding, let us briefly summarize our results here and also try to justify our choice of the gauge group. Our solution of the μ problem is based on a mechanism originally proposed [3] in the context of gauge-mediated supersymmetry breaking and can be viewed as a generalization of the pseudogoldstone mechanism [4]. The crucial observation is that, whenever a large expectation value of some higgs field is triggered through its couplings with a gauge singlet field S, the supersymmetry breaking effects shift the vev of S from zero by an amount of the order of the low energy supersymmetry breaking scale (which can be parameterized by the gravitino mass $m_{3/2} \sim 100$ GeV $-$ 1 TeV in theories with gravity-mediated supersymmetry breaking [5]). This allows one to induce the μ term via the coupling $Sh^{(1)}h^{(2)}$ in the superpotential, where $h^{(1)}, h^{(2)}$ denote the MSSM higgs doublets. As we will see below, this shift of the vev of S from zero is quite insensitive to the value of the large scale M. A priori, any symmetry group broken

at M is suitable for generating the μ term. Our choice of $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ is motivated by the fact that it also can lead to 'hot' dark matter in neutrinos with mass in the eV range. A global $U(1)$ R-symmetry plays an essential role in our analysis. Its unbroken Z_2 subgroup acts as 'matter parity', which implies a stable LSP. The R-symmetry also gives rise to an accidental $U(1)_B$, including higher order terms in the superpotential, which leads to a stable proton. The model predicts a spectral index of primordial density fluctuations that is extremely close to unity and which is consistent with a 'cold' plus 'hot' dark matter scenario of structure formation [6].

Let us first describe the main features of the G_{LR} symmetric model which solve the μ problem. In fact, the solution can work in any scheme with gravity-mediated supersymmetry breaking provided there is an additional symmetry group factor broken at some scale $>> m_{3/2}$ (or even simply a superheavy vev). The $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ group is broken by a pair of $SU(2)_R$ doublet chiral superfields $l^c, \bar{l}^c$ which acquire a vev $M >> m_{3/2}$. In order to achieve this breaking by a renormalizable superpotential, we will need a gauge singlet chiral superfield S. This singlet plays a crucial three-fold role: 1) it triggers $SU(2)_R$ breaking; 2) it generates the μ and $B\mu$ terms of MSSM after supersymmetry breaking; and 3) it leads to hybrid inflation [7]. To see this, we first ignore the matter fields of the model and consider the superpotential

$$W = S(\kappa l^c \bar{l}^c + \lambda h^2 - \kappa M^2), \tag{1}$$

where the chiral superfield $h = (h^{(1)}, h^{(2)})$ belongs to a bidoublet $(2,2)$ representation of $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$, and h^2 denotes the unique bilinear invariant $\epsilon^{ij} h_i^{(1)} h_j^{(2)}$. Note that, through a suitable redefinition of the superfields, the parameters κ, λ and M can be made real and positive. Also note that W in Eq.(1) has the most general renormalizable form invariant under the gauge group and a continuous $U(1)$ R-symmetry under which S carries the same charge as W, while $h, l^c \bar{l}^c$ are neutral. Clearly, a vev of S will generate a μ term with $\mu = \lambda < S >$. Moreover, the vev of its F component, $F_S = \frac{\partial W}{\partial S}$, together with the soft trilinear gravity-mediated terms will generate a bilinear soft term, $B\mu h^{(1)} \epsilon h^{(2)}$, in the scalar potential.

To understand how the μ problem is solved, let us analyze the minimum of the scalar potential. In the unbroken global supersymmetry limit, the vacuum is at

$$S = 0, \quad \kappa l^c \bar{l}^c + \lambda h^2 = \kappa M^2, \quad l^c = e^{i\phi} \bar{l}^{c*} \quad h_i^{(1)} = e^{i\theta} \epsilon_{ij} h^{(2)j*}, \tag{2}$$

where the last two conditions arise from the requirement of D flatness. We see that there is a flat direction (with two real dimensions) at generic points of which both $SU(2)_L$ and $SU(2)_R$ are spontaneously broken. The supersymmetry breaking will lift this degeneracy. Clearly, the desirable vacuum is the one with $h^{(1),(2)} = 0$ and $l^c \bar{l}^c = M^2$ (up to higher order corrections). Whether this indeed is the case depends on the parameters of the model and the cosmological history (see below).

Let us investigate the theory about this supersymmetric minimum. The $SU(2)_R$ is broken and all states in $l^c, \bar{l}^c$ obtain masses $\sim M$ either through the superhiggs effect or through their mixing with the S superfield. The masses of S and of the higgs components of $l^c, \bar{l}^c$ are $m_{infl} = m_S = m_{l^c} = \sqrt{2}\kappa M$. The only massless (up to supersymmetry breaking corrections) non-gauge degrees of freedom so far are the two higgs doublets in h. Their 'masslessness' can be simply understood from their pseudogoldstone nature [4]: they are zero modes of the vacuum flat direction. Gravity-mediated soft terms lift the degeneracy along the flat direction, the doublets acquire masses $\sim m_{3/2}$, and the μ term is generated by a shift ($\sim m_{3/2}$) of the vev of S from zero. Such an automatic generation of the $\mu^2 \sim B\mu (\sim m_{3/2}^2)$ terms after supersymmetry breaking is a generic feature of the models in which the higgs doublets are pseudogoldstone particles [4].

To make the connection more transparent, let us take $\lambda = \kappa$ for a moment. In this limit, the superpotential in Eq.(1) has an accidental $U(4)$ symmetry under which the $(l^c, h^{(1)})$ and $(\bar{l}^c, \epsilon h^{(2)})$ states transform as the fundamental and anti-fundamental representations respectively. Of course, the G_{LR} gauge interactions and the Yukawa couplings break the $U(4)$ symmetry explicitly, but this breaking cannot affect the vacuum degeneracy as long as supersymmetry is unbroken. Thus, the degeneracy of the vacuum manifold is as if we had an exact $U(4)$ symmetry broken to $U(3)$ by the vevs of $l^c, \bar{l}^c$. This breaking produces seven would-be goldstone superfields, three of which are the true 'goldstones' that are absorbed by the massive $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}/U(1)_Y$ gauge superfields. The remaining four are the physical states $h^{(1)}, h^{(2)}$. They are 'pseudogoldstones' and obtain masses only after supersymmetry breaking. At tree level, however, one combination, $h^{(1)} + \epsilon h^{(2)*}$, must be exactly massless as a result of the $U(4)$ symmetry and only gets

a mass by radiative corrections. This implies the generic relation $\mu^2 + m_{3/2}^2 = -B\mu$ in the $U(4)$ symmetric case. For $\lambda \neq \kappa$, the $U(4)$ symmetry is explicitly broken in the superpotential and the above relation holds only approximately.

To see how all this works in detail, we write the full low-energy scalar potential including the soft terms (for simplicity, we discuss the case with a canonical Kähler metric, but the results stay essentially intact even in the general case). We have

$$V = |\kappa l^c \bar{l}^c + \lambda h^2 - \kappa M^2|^2 + (m_{3/2}^2 + \kappa^2 |\bar{l}^c|^2 + \kappa^2 |l^c|^2 + \lambda^2 |h|^2)|S|^2 + m_{3/2}^2 (|\bar{l}^c|^2 + |l^c|^2 + |h|^2) + \left(A m_{3/2} S(\kappa l^c \bar{l}^c + \lambda h^2) - (A-2) m_{3/2} S \kappa M^2 + \text{h.c.} \right). \quad (3)$$

Since S and the l^c,$\bar{l}^c$ fields are heavy in the vanishing $m_{3/2}$ limit, their vevs cannot be shifted significantly by the tiny soft supersymmetry breaking effects. For a leading order estimate of the vev of S, we can substitute in V the supersymmetric vevs of the $SU(2)_R$ doublets. We see that S gets a destabilizing tadpole term $\simeq 2\kappa m_{3/2} M^2 S + \text{h.c.}$, and taking account of the term $\simeq 2\kappa^2 M^2 |S|^2$, the resulting vev of S is $\simeq -m_{3/2}/\kappa$. The vev of S will generate a μ term with $\mu = \lambda < S >= -m_{3/2}\lambda/\kappa$, whereas the vev of its F-component together with the soft trilinear gravity-mediated terms will generate a $B\mu$ term in the scalar potential with

$$B\mu = \lambda \left(F_S^* + m_{3/2} S A \right). \quad (4)$$

The magnitude of $B\mu$ is readily found using the equation of motion of l^c:

$$\kappa \bar{l}^c (\kappa l^c \bar{l}^c + \lambda h^2 - \kappa M^2)^* + (\kappa^2 |S|^2 + m_{3/2}^2) l^{c*} + A m_{3/2} S \kappa \bar{l}^c = 0. \quad (5)$$

One obtains $B\mu \simeq -2\lambda m_{3/2}^2/\kappa$. The above leading order estimates can be confirmed by an explicit minimization of V using the iterative series $l^c = \bar{l}^c = M(1 + \sum_{n\geq 1} c_n (m_{3/2}/M)^n)$ and $S = -(m_{3/2}/\kappa)(1 + \sum_{n\geq 1} d_n (m_{3/2}/M)^n)$.

So far we were expanding the theory about the 'good' minimum at $h = 0, l^c = \bar{l}^c = M$, assuming that this is the prefered ground state of the system. Now we must check the self-consistency of this assumption. One can show that, in the case of minimal Kähler potential, both the 'good' ($h = 0, l^c, \bar{l}^c \neq 0$) and the 'bad' ($h \neq 0, l^c, \bar{l}^c = 0$) points are local minima of the potential for all values of the parameters. In fact, they are the only minima for $\kappa \neq \lambda$. For $\kappa = \lambda$, the degeneracy of the vacuum is not totally lifted and

these points lie on a flat direction, with one real dimension. A simple way to see that the 'good' stationary point is never unstable is to observe that the electroweak higgs mass squared matrix has no negative eigenvalues. This is due to the fact that the diagonal elements of this matrix are equal to $\lambda^2|S|^2 + m_{3/2}^2$, while its off diagonal elements are $B\mu = (-\lambda/\kappa)(\kappa^2|S|^2 + m_{3/2}^2)$, as one can deduce from Eqs.(4) and (5). The determinant of this matrix is then equal to $(\lambda^2/\kappa^2 - 1)(\lambda^2\kappa^2|S|^4 - m_{3/2}^4)$ which, replacing S by its leading order vev, becomes equal to $(\lambda^2/\kappa^2 - 1)^2 m_{3/2}^4 \geq 0$. This together with the obvious positivity of its trace imply that this matrix has no negative eigenvalues for all values of the parameters. This statement remains true even if higher order corrections to the vev of S are included. As it turns out, for any choice of the parameters, the 'good' and 'bad' minima of V are degenerate to leading order (up to corrections of order $m_{3/2}^4$ in the energy difference). If we allow for a non-minimal Kähler potential, the degeneracy between these minima can be lifted. In fact, we can find ranges of parameters where the 'bad' point ceases even to be a local minimum. For example, by replacing $(A - 2)$ in Eq.(3) by $(A - 2\alpha)$, we can have the 'good' point as the unique local minimum of the potential provided $|\alpha|^2 \geq \lambda/\kappa > 1$ or $|\alpha|^2 \leq \lambda/\kappa < 1$. As we will see, the cosmological evolution prefers the first choice.

We are now ready to introduce the matter fields of the model as well. The superpotential takes the following form:

$$W = S(\kappa l^c \bar{l}^c + \lambda h^2 - \kappa M^2) + g_{ab}^q h Q_a Q_b^c + g_{ab}^l h l_a l_b^c + h_{ab} \frac{\bar{l}^c \bar{l}^c l_a^c l_b^c}{M_P}, \tag{6}$$

where Q_a, Q_a^c, l_a, l_a^c are chiral quark, antiquark and lepton superfields respectively and $a, b = 1, 2, 3$ are the family indices. The last term gives superheavy masses to the right handed neutrinos which, through the seesaw mechanism [8], can lead to a 'tau' neutrino mass in the eV range. The superpotential in Eq.(6) has the most general form (up to quartic terms) allowed by the gauge group and a $U(1)$ R-symmetry under which the superfields have the following charges: $R_S = 1,\ R_{l^c} = -R_{\bar{l}^c} = R_h = 0, R_{Q_a} = R_{Q_a^c} = R_{l_a} = R_{l_a^c} = 1/2$. Note that the Z_2 subgroup of this R-symmetry remains unbroken and indeed is the conventional MSSM 'matter parity'.

The $U(1)$ R-symmetry, in contrast to 'matter parity', also eliminates the dimension five [9] operators responsible for proton decay. If one assumes that the R-symmetry is

an exact symmetry then, in fact, it eliminates the baryon number violating operators from the superpotential to all orders. Note that even if the R-symmetry is not explicitly broken by Planck scale suppressed operators in the superpotential it must, in any case, be broken by the hidden sector superfields which break supersymmetry spontaneously and also produce a non-vanishing vev of the superpotential (gravitino mass). So, in general, we can expect some higher dimensional baryon number violating terms coming from a nonminimal Kähler potential. These are, however, adequately suppressed. The proton is essentially stable in the present scheme.

Next let us show that this model has a built-in inflationary trajectory in the field space along which the F_S term takes a constant value as in the supersymmetric hybrid inflationary scenario [10,11]. The relevant trajectory in the field space is parameterized by S. The key point here is that S has no self-interactions and appears in the superpotential only linearly. At a generic point of this trajectory with $|S| > \max\left(\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{M}\sqrt{\kappa/\lambda}\right)$, all the gauge non-singlet higgs fields obtain masses of order $|S|$ and, therefore, they decouple. The massless degrees of freedom along this trajectory are: the singlet S, the massless G_{LR} gauge supermultiplet, and the massless matter superfields. The effective low energy superpotential, which is obtained after integrating out the heavy superfields, can be readily constructed by simply using holomorphy and symmetry arguments. This superpotential is linear in S, namely

$$W_{infl} = -\kappa S M^2. \tag{7}$$

Were it not for the mass scale M in the superpotential, the trajectory parameterized by S would simply correspond to a supersymmetry preserving vacuum direction remaining flat to all orders in perturbation theory. The F_S term, however, lifts this flat direction so that, at tree level, it takes an asymptotically constant value for arbitrarily large $|S|$. As a result, the trajectory of interest is represented by a massless degree of freedom S, whose vev sets the mass scale for the heavy particles and provides us with a constant tree level vacuum energy density

$$V_{\rm tree} = \kappa^2 M^4, \tag{8}$$

which is responsible for inflation.

The above result can be easily rederived by an explicit solution of the equations of motion along the inflationary trajectory [10,11]. To this end, we can explicitly minimize all the D and F terms for large values of $|S|$. It is easy to check that, for

$$|S| > \max\left(\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{M}\sqrt{\kappa/\lambda}\right), \tag{9}$$

all the other vevs vanish and, therefore, a nonzero contribution to the potential comes purely from the constant $F_S = -\kappa M^2$ term. Whenever the condition in Eq.(9) is violated, the $l^c, \bar{l}^c$ components become tachyonic and compensate the F_S term. We see that, if $\kappa > \lambda$, h will become tachyonic earlier and the system will evolve towards the 'wrong' minimum. Thus, we prefer $\kappa < \lambda$. The system rapidly approaches the supersymmetric vacuum and oscillates about it. At tree level, the potential along the inflationary trajectory is exactly flat [1]. Radiative corrections, however, create a logarithmic slope [10] that drives the inflaton toward the minimum. The origin of these corrections can be understood in the following way. As we have shown, the value of $|S|$ sets the mass scale for the heavy particles along the inflationary trajectory. Thus, we can think of the low energy theories at different points on this trajectory as being a single theory at different energy scales. This gives rise to a wave function renormalization of the S field through loops involving the $\bar{l}^c, l^c, h$ particles. Since their mass is set by the value of $|S|$, a nontrivial dependence on this value arises providing an effective one-loop potential for the inflaton field. For large field strengths or, in other words, for masses of the particles in the loop suitably larger than M, this potential assumes the following form [10]

$$V_{\mathrm{inf}} \simeq \kappa^2 M^4 \left[1 + \frac{\kappa^2 + \lambda^2}{8\pi^2} \ln\left(\frac{SS^*}{\Lambda^2}\right)\right]. \tag{10}$$

This simply is an asymptotic form of the one-loop corrected effective potential [12] with

---

[1] This statement is exact in the globally supersymmetric limit as well as in supergravity provided the Kähler metric for the field S is canonical [13]. For generic Kähler potentials, however, this is no longer true. For $|S| << M_P$, the problematic term is $(SS^*)^2$, whose coefficient must be somewhat smaller than unity. Various inflationary regimes including this term are considered in refs. [14,15,16].

$$\delta V_{one-loop} = \frac{1}{64\pi^2}\sum_i (-1)^{F_i} M_i^4 \ln(\frac{M_i^2}{\Lambda^2}). \tag{11}$$

The contribution to Eq.(11) comes from the $\bar{l}^c, l^c,$ and h supermultiplets, since they receive at tree level a non-supersymmetric contribution to the masses of their scalar components from the F_S term. All other states have either no mass splitting due to a vanishing coupling with S or have no inflaton dependent mass (these are the gauge and matter fields).

Inflation can end when the condition in Eq.(9) breaks down, thereby signaling that some of the fields become tachyonic and the system moves towards the global minimum. This is indeed the case provided the slow roll conditions [10] are not violated before this instability occurs. As we have argued above, for $\lambda > \kappa$, the system is destabilized towards the $SU(2)_R$ breaking vacuum and oscillates about it. These $S, l^c, \bar{l}^c$ oscillations will create, among other particles, right handed neutrinos. The subsequent decay of these neutrinos gives rise to a primordial lepton number [18]. The observed baryon asymmetry of the universe can then be obtained by partial conversion of this lepton asymmetry through non-perturbative sphaleron effects [17]. This process, in a certain range of the parameter space, can lead to a successful baryogenesis via leptogenesis [18]. The gravitino constraint on the 'reheat' temperature can also be simultaneously satisfied and the spectral index of primordial density fluctuations turns out to be extremely close to unity. The details are quite involved and will not be discussed here, but one fact is worth noting. The $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ breaking scale turns out to be about an order of magnitude lower than the MSSM unification scale and, thus, the right handed neutrino masses are restricted to be smaller than about 10^{13} GeV. This implies that at least the 'tau' neutrino mass can be in the eV range.

The model discussed above, although based on the $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ gauge group, is L-R asymmetric in the higgs sector. This is acceptable since, in reality, the above scheme must be a low energy remnant of a more fundamental theory in which the L-R discrete symmetry is spontaneously broken at a scale $M_{LR} > M$. We will now discuss some possibilities for such an embedding of our model. The superpotential can be generalized to be L-R symmetric by adding a pair of chiral higgs $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_{B-L}$ doublet superfields $l, \bar{l}$:

$$W = S\left(\kappa(l^c\bar{l}^c + \bar{l}l) + \lambda h^2 - \kappa M^2\right). \tag{12}$$

However, this structure is somewhat problematic. The orientation of the superheavy vevs in the L-R space is arbitrary due to the presence of an accidental global $U(4)$ symmetry in the superpotential which leads to a larger continuous degeneracy of the vacuum manifold. Therefore, at the point $l^c = \bar{l}^c = M$, the $l, \bar{l}$ doublet pair will appear exactly massless (in the supersymmetric limit) just as the h superfield. Supersymmetry breaking effects will provide a small ($\sim M_W$) mass to these doublets. In order to maintain the gauge unification, we must supplement the low energy sector with some color triplets. Note that this problem will not arise if the $l^c, \bar{l}^c$ and $l, \bar{l}$ states are embedded in the $16, \overline{16}$ higgs representations of the $SO(10)$ group so that the $l^c, \bar{l}^c$ vevs break $SO(10)$ down to $SU(5)$ [19]. In this case, the $l, \bar{l}$ states will come in complete multiplets under the $SU(5)$ subgroup and the unification of the gauge couplings will be unaffected. Moreover, all these additional states can get masses via the couplings of the 16-plets to the other higgs representations. We will not discuss the $SO(10)$ embedding in this paper.

In summary, we have presented a supersymmetric model based on the $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ gauge group where the μ and $B\mu$ terms are automatically generated after supersymmetry breaking. Moreover, the model gives rise to hybrid inflation. The observed baryon asymmetry of the universe can be successfully generated through primordial leptogenesis, while the 'hot' component of the dark matter in the universe consists of neutrinos with masses in the eV range. Finally, baryon number is essentially conserved.

We would like to thank J. Garcia-Bellido, S. King, R. Rattazzi and N. Tetradis for useful discussions. One of us (Q.S.) would like to acknowledge the DOE support under grant number DE-FG02-91ER40626. Q.S. and G.L. also acknowledge the NATO support, contract number NATO CRG-970149. Finally, G.D. and G.L. acknowledge the TMR support under grant number ERBFMRXCT-960090.

REFERENCES

[1] J.C. Pati and A. Salam, Phys. Rev. **D10** (1974) 275; R.N. Mohapatra and J.C. Pati, Phys. Rev. **D11** (1975) 566; G. Senjanovic and R.N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. **D12** (1975) 1502; G. Senjanovic, Nucl. Phys. **B153** (1979) 334; M. Magg, Q. Shafi and C. Wetterich, Phys. Lett. **B87** (1979) 227.

[2] See, e.g., M. Cvetic and J.C. Pati, Phys. Lett. **B135**, 57 (1984); R. Kuchimanchi and R.N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. **D48** (1993) 4352; Phys. Rev. Lett. **75** (1995) 3989; C.S. Aulakh, K. Benakli and G. Senjanovic, hep-ph/9703434; C.S. Aulakh, A. Melfo and G. Senjanovic, hep-ph/9707256.

[3] G. Dvali, G.F. Giudice and A. Pomarol, Nucl. Phys. **B478** (1996) 31; S. Dimopoulos, G. Dvali and R. Rattazzi, hep-ph/9707537.

[4] See, e.g., K. Inoue, A. Kakuto and H. Takano, Prog. Theor. Phys. **75** (1986) 664; A. Anselm and A. Johansen, Phys. Lett. **B200** (1988) 331; Z. Berezhiani and G. Dvali, Sov. Phys. Lebedev Inst. Rep. **5** (1989) 55; R. Barbieri, G. Dvali and A. Strumia, Nucl. Phys. **B391** (1993) 487; R. Barbieri, G. Dvali and M. Moretti, Phys. Lett. **B312** (1993) 137; G. Dvali and Q. Shafi, Phys. Lett. **B326** (1994) 258; Bartol Preprint BA-94-42 (1994), unpublished; R. Barbieri, G. Dvali, A. Strumia, Z. Berezhiani and L. Hall, Nucl. Phys. **B432** (1994) 49; Z. Berezhiani, C. Csáki and L. Randall, Nucl. Phys. **B444** (1995) 61; Z. Berezhiani, Phys. Lett. **B355** (1995) 481; C. Csáki and L. Randall, Nucl. Phys. **B466** (1996) 41; B. Ananthanarayan and Q. Shafi, Phys. Rev. **D54** (1996) 3488; G. Dvali and S. Pokorski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997) 807.

[5] R. Barbieri, S. Ferrara and C.A. Savoy, Phys. Lett. **B119** (1982) 343; A.H. Chamseddine, R. Arnowitt and P. Nath, Phys. Rev. Lett. **B49** (1982) 970; H.-P. Nilles, M. Srednicki and D. Wyler, Phys. Lett. **B120** (1983) 346; L. Hall, J. Lykken and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D27** (1983) 2359.

[6] Q. Shafi and F.W. Stecker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53** (1984) 1292; for a recent review and other references see Q. Shafi and R.K. Schaefer, hep-ph/9612428.

[7] A.D. Linde, Phys. Lett. **B259** (1991) 38; Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 748.

[8] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, in: Supergravity, eds. P. van Niewenhuizen and D.Z. Freedman (North Holland 1979); T. Yanagida, in: Proceedings of Workshop on Unified Theory and Baryon number in the Universe, eds. O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto (KEK, 1979); R.N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44** (1980) 912.

[9] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D26** (1982) 287; N. Sakai and T. Yanagida, Nucl. Phys. **B197** (1982) 533.

[10] G. Dvali, Q. Shafi and R. Schaefer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73** (1994) 1886; G. Dvali, Phys. Lett. **B355** (1995) 78; Phys. Lett. **B387** (1996) 471.

[11] G. Lazarides, R. Schaefer and Q. Shafi, Phys. Rev. **D56** (1997) 1324.

[12] S. Coleman and E. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D7** (1973) 1888.

[13] E.J. Copeland, A.R. Liddle, D.H. Lyth, E.D. Stewart and D. Wands, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 6410.

[14] C. Panagiotakopoulos, Phys. Rev. **D55** (1997) 7335.

[15] A. Linde and A. Riotto, Phys. Rev. **D56** (1997) 1841.

[16] S. Dimopoulos, G. Dvali and R. Rattazzi, hep-ph/9705348.

[17] V.A. Kuzmin, V.A. Rubakov and M.E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. **155B** (1985) 36.

[18] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. **174B** (1986) 45; G. Lazarides and Q. Shafi, Phys. Lett. **B258** (1992) 305; L. Covi, E. Roulet and F. Vissani, Phys. Lett. **B384** (1996) 169.

[19] R. Jeannerot, Phys. Rev. **D53** (1996) 5426.